

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the remarks herewith.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-21 are pending. No claim is amended in this paper.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-9, 13, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,583,560 to Florin et al. (hereinafter, merely “Florin”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,496,228 to McGee et al. (hereinafter, merely “McGee”) and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,177,931 to Alexander et al. (hereinafter, merely “Alexander”) and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,835,087 to Herz et al. (hereinafter, merely “Herz”).

Claims 10-12, 14-17, and 19-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Florin in view of McGee, Alexander, Herz, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,977,974 to Hatori et al. (hereinafter, merely “Hatori”).

III. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“... wherein **a selected child screen is positioned in a center region of the menu screen by shifting the entire menu screen** and gradually enlarged to encompass substantially all of the screen...” (emphasis added)

The Office Action (see pages 2 and 5) relies on the “Pix function” of Florin to reject the above-identified features of claim 1. Specifically, the Office Action relies on column 20, line 51-column 31, line 15 and item 380 in Figure 34 of Florin to reject a selected child screen is positioned in a center region of the menu screen by shifting the entire menu screen, as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added).

The description of Figure 34 of Florin states:

“Referring now to FIG. 34, which illustrates the selection of a different pix program to be viewed in the central picture-in-picture window 375. By depressing the left arrow button 148 on the remote control device 60, the highlighting 380 is moved one window to the left. In the example of FIG. 34, a “Discover It” program is now highlighted and shown simultaneously in the central picture-in-picture window 375. Similarly, through the use of the left arrow button 148 and the right arrow button 150 along with the up arrow button 145 and the down arrow button 146 on the remote control device 60, each of the pix programs in the pix display 381 may be viewed within the central picture-in-picture window 375, as desired. As in the list function, pressing the select button 155 displays the currently highlighted program in full screen. Alternatively, pressing the pix button 144 a second time causes the pix display 381 to disappear and the last highlighted program appears in full screen.” (emphasis added, see Florin, column 21, lines 1-18)

The “Pix function” of Florin arranges 12 child displays around 1 center display on a same screen. A highlighting mark 380 is shifted among the child displays. When the highlighting mark 380 is on a child display, the center portion displays contents of the child display simultaneously. (see column 20, line 51-column 31, line 15 and item 380 in Figure 34 of Florin).

It is noted that Florin shifts a highlighting mark among the child displays in direct contrast with Applicants’ claimed shifting the entire screen. (see bold portion of Florin above)

“...the highlighting 380 is moved one window to the left.”) Florin does not shift the child displays either. Applicants further submit that all the 10 child displays and 1 center display is on a same screen. Therefore, displaying contents of a child display, as described in Florin, in the center display never requires shifting the entire screen, as recited in claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that Florin, McGee, Alexander, Herz, and Hatori, taken either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of claim 1. Specifically, Applicants submit that there is no teaching or suggestion of a selected child screen positioned in a center region of the menu screen by shifting the entire menu screen and gradually enlarged to encompass substantially all of the screen, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claims 4 and 18 are also believed to be patentable.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 4 and 18 are patentable.

IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims are dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Similarly, because Applicants maintain that all claims are allowable for at least the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken

as acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicants reserve the right to address such comments.

CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of the statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By: 

Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800